arXiv:1006.3902v2 [math.GN] 15 Mar 2012

On a metric on the space of idempotent probability measures

A. A. Zaitov, I. I. Tojiev

Abstract

In this paper we construct a metric on the space of idempotent probability measures on the given compactum, which is an idempotent analog of the Kantorovich metric on the space of probability measures.

Keywords: metric, idempotent probability measures.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 54C65, 52A30; Secondary 28A33.

1 Introduction

Our goal is to prove the following

Theorem 1. *The function $\rho_I : I(X) \times I(X) \to R$ is a metric on the space $I(X)$ of idempotent probability measures on the given compactum X which generates pointwise convergence topology in $I(X)$, where ρ_I defines by the equality (6).*

A metrizable compact Hausdorff space is called a compactum.

The metric ρ_I on the space $I(X)$ of idempotent probability measures on the given compactum X constructed in present paper is an positive answer to the Question 7.8 placed in [1] (the question expresses as follows: is there a counterpart of the Prokhorov metric for the functor of idempotent probability measures?)

The notion of idempotent measure finds important applications in different part of mathematics, mathematical physics, economics, mathematical biology and others. One can find a row of applications of idempotent mathematics from [2].

Let S be a set equipped with two algebraic operation: addition $\oplus$ and multiplication $\odot$. S is called a semiring if the following conditions hold:

(i) the addition $\oplus$ and the multiplication $\odot$ are associative;

(ii) the addition $\oplus$ is commutative;

(iii) the multiplication $\odot$ is distributive with respect to the addition $\oplus$.

A semiring S is commutative if the multiplication $\odot$ is commutative. A unity of semiring S is an element $\mathbf{1} \in S$ such that $\mathbf{1} \odot x = x \odot \mathbf{1} = x$ for all $x \in S$. A zero of a semiring S is an element $\mathbf{0} \in S$ such that $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0} \oplus x = x$, $\mathbf{0} \odot x = x \odot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ for all $x \in S$. A semiring S is idempotent if $x \oplus x = x$ for all $x \in S$. A semiring S with zero $\mathbf{0}$ and unity $\mathbf{1}$ is called a semifield if each nonzero element $x \in S$ is invertible.

Let $(S, \oplus, \odot, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ be a semiring. On S a partially order $\prec$ arises by naturally way: for elements $a, b \in S$ by definition we have $a \prec b$ if and only if $a \oplus b = b$. So, all elements of S are nonnegative: $\mathbf{0} \prec x$ for all $x \in S$. The idempotent analog of functions are maps $X \to S$ where X is an arbitrary set and S is an idempotent semiring. S-valued functions may be added, multiplied by each other and multiplied by elements of S.

The idempotent analog of the linear space of functions is a set of S-valued functions $X \to S$, which is closed under addition of functions and multiplication of functions by elements of S (which is S-semimodule). Denote by $B(X, S)$ the semimodule of functions $X \to S$ that are bounded in the sense of the order $\prec$ on S. A functional $f : B(X, S) \to S$ by definition is idempotent linear (or *maxplus*-linear) if

$$f(\lambda_1 \odot \varphi_1 \oplus \lambda_2 \odot \varphi_2) = \lambda_1 \odot f(\varphi_1) \oplus \lambda_2 \odot f(\varphi_2)$$

for all λ_1, $\lambda_2 \in S$ and φ_1, $\varphi_2 \in B(X, S)$.

Let $\mathbb{R}$ be the field of real numbers and $\mathbb{R}_+$ the semifield of nonnegative real numbers (with respect to the usual operations). The change of variables $x \mapsto u = h\ln x$, $h > 0$, defines a map $\Phi_h : \mathbb{R}_+ \to S = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$. Let the operations of addition $\oplus$ and multiplication $\odot$ on S be the images of the usual operations of addition $+$ and multiplication $\cdot$ on $\mathbb{R}$, respectively, by the map Φ_h, i. e. let $u \oplus_h v = h\ln(\exp(u/h) + \exp(v/h))$, $u \odot v = u + v$. Then we have $\mathbf{0} = -\infty = \Phi_h(0)$, $\mathbf{1} = 0 = \Phi_h(1)$. It is easy to see that $u \oplus_h v \to \max\{u, v\}$ as $h \to 0$. Hence, S forms semifield with respect to operations $u \oplus v = \max\{u, v\}$ and $u \odot v = u + v$. It denotes by $\mathbb{R}_{\max}$. It is idempotent. This passage from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}_{\max}$ is called the Maslov dequantization.

Let X be a compact Hausdorff space, $C(X)$ the algebra of continuous functions $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with the usual algebraic operations. On $C(X)$ the operations $\oplus$ and $\odot$ define as follow:

$\varphi \oplus \psi = \max\{\varphi, \psi\}$, where $\varphi, \psi \in C(X)$,

$\varphi \odot \psi = \varphi + \psi$, where φ, $\psi \in C(X)$,

$\lambda \odot \varphi = \varphi + \lambda_X$, where $\varphi \in C(X)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and λ_X is a constant function.

Recall [1] that a functional $\mu : C(X) \to \mathbb{R}(\subset \mathbb{R}_{\max})$ is called to be an idempotent probability measure on X, if:

1) $\mu(\lambda_X) = \lambda$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$;
2) $\mu(\lambda \odot \varphi) = \mu(\varphi) + \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi \in C(X)$;
3) $\mu(\varphi \oplus \psi) = \mu(\varphi) \oplus \mu(\psi)$ for every φ, $\psi \in C(X)$.

The number $\mu(\varphi)$ is named Maslov integral of the function $\varphi \in C(X)$ with respect to μ.

For a compact Hausdorff space X a set of all idempotent probability measures on X denotes by $I(X)$. Consider $I(X)$ as a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{C(X)}$. In the induced topology the sets

$$\langle \mu; \varphi_1, \varphi_2, ..., \varphi_k; \varepsilon\rangle = \{\nu \in I(X) : |\mu(\varphi_i) - \nu(\varphi_i)| < \varepsilon, i = 1, ..., k\},$$

form a base of neighborhoods of the idempotent measure $\mu \in I(X)$, where $\varphi_i \in C(X)$, $i = 1, ..., k$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. The topology generated by this base coincide with pointwise topology on $I(X)$. The topological space $I(X)$ is compact [1].

Given a map $f : X \to Y$ of compact Hausdorff spaces the map $I(f) : I(X) \to I(Y)$ defines by the formula $I(f)(\mu)(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi \circ f)$, $\mu \in I(X)$, where $\varphi \in C(Y)$.

The construction I is a covariant functor, acting in the category of compact Hausdorff spaces and their continuous mappings. Moreover, I is normal functor [1]. Hence, in particular, yields that if X is compactum then $I(X)$ is also compactum. From here a question about construction a metric on $I(X)$ generated the pointwise topology on $I(X)$ arises in a naturally way. In the present paper we will construct this metric.

Since I is normal functor then for an arbitrary idempotent measure $\mu \in I(X)$ we may define the support of μ:

$$\text{supp } \mu = \bigcap\{A \subset X : \overline{A} = A,\ \mu \in I(A)\}.$$

For brevity, put $S\mu = \text{supp}\mu$.

For a positive integer n put $I_n(X) = \{\mu \in I(X) : |\text{supp}\mu| \leq n\}$. Define the following set

$$I_\omega(X) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n(X).$$

It is known [1] that $I_\omega(X)$ is everywhere dense in $I(X)$. A functional $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$ is named as an idempotent probability measure with finite support.

Note that if μ is an idempotent probability measure with a finite support $\text{supp}\mu = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_k\}$ then it represents in the form

$$\mu = \lambda_1 \odot \delta_{x_1} \oplus \lambda_2 \odot \delta_{x_2} \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_k \odot \delta_{x_k} \tag{2}$$

uniquely, where $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}$, $i = 1, ..., k$, $\lambda_1 \oplus \lambda_2 \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_k = \mathbf{1}$.

2 The proof of Theorem 1

Let $\mu_1,\ \mu_2 \in I_\omega(X)$. Then by (2) we have $\mu_k = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n_k} \lambda_k \odot \delta_{x_{ki}}$, $i = 1,\ 2$. Put

$$\Lambda_{12} = \Lambda(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) = \{\xi \in I(X^2) : I(\pi_i)(\xi) = \mu_i,\ i = 1, 2\},$$

where $\pi_i : X \times X \longrightarrow X$ is projection onto i-th faction, $i = 1, 2$. We show the set $\Lambda(\mu_1,\ \mu_2)$ is nonempty. Without loosing of generality suppose $\lambda_{11} = \lambda_{21} = 0$. Directly checking then shows that $I(\pi_i)(\xi) = \mu_i$, $i = 1,\ 2$, for all idempotent probability measures $\xi \in I(X^2)$ of the form $\xi = \xi^0 \oplus R(\mu_1,\ \mu_2)$. Here

$$\xi^0 = 0 \odot \delta(x_{11}, x_{21}) \oplus \bigoplus_{t=2}^{n_2} \lambda_{2t} \odot \delta(x_{11}, x_{2t}) \oplus \bigoplus_{t=2}^{n_1} \lambda_{1t} \odot \delta(x_{1t}, x_{21})$$

is idempotent probability measures on X^2 and

$$R(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \bigoplus_{\substack{k \in K, \\ m \in M}} \gamma_{km} \odot \delta(x_{1k}, x_{2m})$$

is some functional on $C(X)$ where

$$\gamma_{km} \leq \min\{\lambda_{1k}, \lambda_{2m}\},\ k \in K,\ m \in M,\ K \subset \{2, ..., n_1\},\ M \subset \{2, ..., n_2\}.$$

Thus $\xi \in \Lambda(\mu_1,\ \mu_2)$. Here in fact more is proved: it is easy to see if $n_1 \geq 2$ and $n_2 \geq 2$ then quantity of the numbers γ_{km} is uncountable. From here one concludes that the cardinality of the set $\Lambda(\mu_1,\ \mu_2)$ is no less than continuum as soon as each of supports $S\mu_i$, i=1,2, contains no less than two points.

Note that $\xi = \xi^0$ if one takes empty set as K and M.

By definition for each idempotent probability measure $\xi \in \Lambda(\mu_1,\ \mu_2)$ we have $\bigoplus\limits_{(x_j, x_k) \in S\xi} |\lambda_{2k} - \lambda_{1j}| \odot \rho(x_{1j}, x_{2k}) < \infty$. In other hand as the set

$$\{|\lambda_{2k} - \lambda_{1j}| \odot \rho(x_{1j}, x_{2k}) : j = 1, ..., n_1; k = 1, ..., n_2\} \tag{3}$$

is finite there exists the number

$$\min_{\xi \in \Lambda_{12}} \left\{ \bigoplus_{(x_j, x_k) \in S\xi} |\lambda_{2k} - \lambda_{1j}| \odot \rho(x_{1j}, x_{2k}) \right\}.$$

Put

$$H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) = \min_{\xi \in \Lambda_{12}} \left\{ \bigoplus_{(x_j, x_k) \in S\xi} |\lambda_{2k} - \lambda_{1j}| \odot \rho(x_{1j}, x_{2k}) \right\}. \tag{4}$$

Here the following statement takes place.

Lemma 1. *For an arbitrary pair $\mu_1,\ \mu_2 \in I_\omega(X)$ of idempotent probability measures with decomposition (2) there exists an idempotent probability measure $\xi_{12} \in \Lambda_{12}$ such that*

$$H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) = \bigoplus_{(x_j, x_k) \in S\xi_{12}} |\lambda_{2k} - \lambda_{1j}| \odot \rho(x_{1j}, x_{2k}).$$

Proof is followed from the finiteness of the set (3).

The following Lemma is rather obvious.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mu_1,\ \mu_2 \in I_\omega(X)$ be an arbitrary pair of idempotent probability measures with decompositions (2). Then for each idempotent probability measure $\xi_{12} \in \Lambda_{12}$ the following equations hold*

$$\pi_i(S\xi_{12}) = S\mu_i, \qquad i = 1, 2.$$

Finally, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mu_1,\ \mu_2,\ \mu_3 \in I_\omega(X)$ be an arbitrary three of idempotent probability measures with decompositions of the form (2). Let, moreover, $\xi_{12} \in \Lambda_{12}$ and $\xi_{23} \in \Lambda_{23}$ be idempotent probability measures satisfying the conclude of Lemma 1. Then there exists an idempotent probability measure $\xi_{13} \in \Lambda_{13}$ such that*

$$S\xi_{13} = \{(x_{1k}, x_{3l}) : \textit{there is an } m \in \{1, ..., n_2\} \textit{ such that}$$

$$(x_{1k}, x_{2m}) \in S\xi_{12} \textit{ and } (x_{2m}, x_{3l}) \in S\xi_{23}\}.$$

PROOF. Lemma 2 implies that $\pi_2(S\xi_{12}) = \pi_1(S\xi_{23}) = S\mu_2$. For $m \in \{1, ..., n_2\}$ let $k_1(m), ..., k_{p(m)}(m) \in \{1, ..., n_1\}$ and $l_1(m), ..., l_{q(m)}(m) \in \{1, ..., n_3\}$ be numbers such that $(x_{1k_r(m)}, x_{2m}) \in S\xi_{12}$ when $r = 1, ..., p(m)$ and $(x_{2m}, x_{3l_s(m)}) \in S\xi_{23}$ when $s = 1, ..., q(m)$. If is clear that

$$\{(x_{1k_r(m)},\ x_{2m}) :\ r = 1, ..., p(m);\ m = 1, ..., n_2\} = S\xi_{12},$$

$$\{(x_{2m},\ x_{3l_s(m)}) :\ s = 1, ..., q(m);\ m = 1, ..., n_2\} = S\xi_{23}.$$

Consider the following functional

$$\xi = \bigoplus_{\substack{m = 1, ..., n_2; \\ r = 1, ..., p(m); \\ s = 1, ..., q(m)}} (\lambda_{1k_r(m)} \odot \lambda_{3l_s(m)}) \odot \delta(x_{1k_r(m)},\ x_{3l_s(m)}).$$

Let $\lambda_{2m'} = 0$ for some $m' \in \{1, ..., n_2\}$. Since ξ_{12} and ξ_{23} are idempotent probability measures there exist $r \in \{1, ..., p(m')\}$ and $s \in \{1, ..., q(m')\}$ such that $\xi_{1k_r(m)} = 0$ and $\xi_{3l_s(m)} = 0$. This means that ξ is idempotent probability measure.

If the number $m' \in \{1, ..., n_2\}$ is uniquely for which the equality $\lambda_{2m'} = 0$ holds then

$$\{k_1(m'), ..., k_{p(m')}(m')\} = \{1, ..., n_1\} \text{ and } \{l_1(m'), ..., l_{s(m')}(m')\} = \{1, ..., n_3\}.$$

In this case the assertion of the Lemma carries out.

If $\lambda_{2t} = 0$ fulfils only for two values $t = m'$ and $t = m''$ then

$$\{k_1(m'), ..., k_{p(m')}(m')\} \cup \{k_1(m''), ..., k_{p(m'')}(m'')\} = \{1, ..., n_1\}$$

and

$$\{l_1(m'), ..., l_{s(m')}(m')\} \cup \{l_1(m''), ..., l_{s(m'')}(m'')\} = \{1, ..., n_3\}.$$

From the construction of ξ follows that the assertion is true for this case too.

Continuing this process by the quantity of t for which the equality $\lambda_{2t} = 0$ holds we finish the proof. Lemma 3 is proved.

Proposition 1. *The function $H : I_\omega(X) \times I_\omega(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is metric.*

Proof. Obviously that $H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) \geq 0$ for all pairs $\mu_1,\ \mu_2 \in I_\omega(X)$. Let $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu$. Suppose μ has a decomposition

$$\mu = \lambda_1 \odot \delta(x_1) \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_n \odot \delta(x_n).$$

Then the idempotent probability measures

$$\xi = \lambda_1 \odot \delta(x_1, x_1) \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_n \odot \delta(x_n, x_n)$$

is an element of the $\Lambda(\mu,\ \mu)$ and for which one has

$$H(\mu,\ \mu) \leq \bigoplus_{(x_j, x_j) \in S\xi} |\lambda_j - \lambda_j| \odot \rho(x_j, x_j) = 0.$$

Hence $H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) = 0$.

Inversely let now $H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) = 0$ where $\mu_1,\ \mu_2$ are arbitrary idempotent probability measures with finite supports admitting decompositions (2). Then (4) implies existence an idempotent probability measures $\xi_{12} \in \Lambda_{12}$ such that $S\xi_{12} \subset \Delta(X) \equiv \{(x, x) : x \in X\}$. This is possible only provided $S\mu_1 = S\mu_2$. On the other hand again from (4) it follows that $|\lambda_{2j} - \lambda_{1j}| = 0$ for all j. Hence $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

Thus for idempotent probability measures with finite supports we have $H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) = 0$ if and only if $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

It is clear that H is symmetric.

It remains to show H satisfies the triangle axiom. Let $\mu_1,\ \mu_2,\ \mu_3$ are idempotent probability measures with finite supports admitting decompositions

$$\mu_i = \lambda_{i1} \odot \delta(x_{1i}) \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_{in_i} \odot \lambda(x_{in_i}),\ \ i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Let ξ_{12} and ξ_{23} be idempotent probability measures which exist according to Lemma 1 and $\xi' \in \Lambda(\mu_1,\ \mu_2)$ be an idempotent probability measure existing by Lemma 3. Then

$$H(\mu_1,\ \mu_3) = \min_{\xi \in \Lambda_{13}} \left\{ \bigoplus_{(x_{1k}, x_{3l}) \in S\xi} |\lambda_{3l} - \lambda_{1k}| \odot \rho(x_{1k}, x_{3l}) \right\} \leq$$

$$\leq \bigoplus_{(x_{1k}, x_{3l}) \in S\xi'} |\lambda_{3l} - \lambda_{1k}| \odot \rho(x_{1k}, x_{3l}) \leq$$

$$\leq \bigoplus_{\substack{(x_{1k}, x_{2m}) \in S\xi_{12}, \\ (x_{2m}, x_{3l}) \in S\xi_{23}}} |\lambda_{2m} - \lambda_{1k}| \odot \rho(x_{1k}, x_{2m}) \odot |\lambda_{3l} - \lambda_{2m}| \odot \rho(x_{2m}, x_{3l}) \leq$$

$$\leq \bigoplus_{(x_{1k}, x_{2m}) \in S\xi_{12}} |\lambda_{2m} - \lambda_{1k}| \odot \rho(x_{1k}, x_{2m}) + \bigoplus_{(x_{2m}, x_{3l}) \in S\xi_{23}} |\lambda_{3l} - \lambda_{2m}| \odot \rho(x_{2m}, x_{3l}) =$$

$$= H(\mu_1,\ \mu_2) + H(\mu_2,\ \mu_3).$$

Proposition 1 is proved.

For idempotent probability measures $\mu_1,\ \mu_2$ with finite supports put

$$\rho_\omega(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \min\{\mathrm{diam} X,\ H(\mu_1, \mu_2)\}. \tag{5}$$

Proposition 1 implies the following

Corollary 1. *The function $\rho_\omega : I_\omega(X) \times I_\omega(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is metric.*

The following proposition shows the metric ρ_ω is expansion of the metric ρ.

Proposition 2. *Let $(X,\ \rho)$ be a compactum, $x,\ y \in X$. Then $\rho_\omega(0 \odot \delta_x,\ 0 \odot \delta_y) = \rho(x,\ y)$.*

Proof. Let $0 \odot \delta_x$ and $0 \odot \delta_y$ be idempotent probability measures. Since $0 \odot \delta_{(x,y)} \equiv 0 \odot \delta_x \otimes 0 \odot \delta_y$ is uniquely idempotent probability measure lying in $\Lambda(0 \odot \delta_x,\ 0 \odot \delta_y)$, then according to (4) and (5) one has

$$\rho_\omega(0 \odot \delta_x,\ 0 \odot \delta_y) = \rho(x,\ y).$$

Proposition 2 is proved.

Since X includes into $I_\omega(X)$ using the natural transformation $\delta_X : X \longrightarrow I_\omega(X)$, acting as $\delta_X(x) = \delta_x \equiv 0 \odot \delta_x$, then compact Hausdorff spaces X and $\delta_X(X)$ may be identify. That is why Proposition 2 implies the following

Corollary 2. *For any compactum (X, ρ) the equality $\rho_\omega|_{X\times X} = \rho$ holds.*

Consider a sequence $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty} \subset I_\omega(X)$ of idempotent probability measures. If the sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ converges to some idempotent probability measure $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$ concerning to metric ρ_ω then it signs by $\mu_t \to \mu$. If the sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ converges to $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$ concerning to pointwise convergence topology, then we use the mark $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$. Recall that a sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ converges to $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$ concerning to pointwise convergence topology if provided $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \mu_t(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi)$ for all $\varphi \in C(X)$. Assume that $\mu = \lambda_1 \odot \delta_{x_1} \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_s \odot \delta_{x_s}$ and $\mu_t = \lambda_{t1} \odot \delta_{x_{t1}} \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_{ts_t} \odot \delta_{x_{ts_t}}$, where $s,\ s_t$ are natural numbers, $t = 1, 2, ...$

For each positive integer t consider a finite set $\{1,\ ...,\ s_t\}$. For every t fix a number $i(t) \in \{1,\ ...,\ s_t\}$. Note that then for each pair of the sequences $\{\lambda_{ti(t)}\}_{t=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\max}$ where $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{s_t} \lambda_{ti} = 0$ for all $t = 1,\ 2, ...,$ and $\{x_{ti(t)}\}_{t=1}^{\infty} \subset X$ there exits an idempotent probability measure μ_t such that $\mu_t = \lambda_{t1} \odot \delta_{x_{t1}} \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_{ti(t)} \odot \delta_{x_{ti(t)}} \oplus ... \oplus \lambda_{ts_t} \odot \delta_{x_{ts_t}}$.

Inversely, let $\{\mu_t\}$ be a sequence of idempotent probability measures with finite supports. For each positive integer t by an arbitrary manner choose at one point $x_{ti(t)} \in \mathrm{supp}\mu_t$ and construct sequences $\{x_{ti(t)}\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$. Similarly it may be constructed sequences $\{\lambda_{ti(i)}\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ of max-mass of idempotent probability measures μ_t.

Theorem 2. *The metric ρ_ω generates on $I_\omega(X)$ pointwise-converges topology.*

The Proof leans on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$, $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty} \subset I_\omega(X)$. Then $\mu_t \to \mu$ iff the following condition holds:*

(*) *for each point $x_i \in \mathrm{supp}\mu$ there exists a sequence $\{x_{ti(t)} : x_{ti(t)} \in \mathrm{supp}\mu_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\rho(x_i,\ x_{ti(t)}) \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and $\lambda_{ti(t)} \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda_i$ where $\lambda_{ti(t)}$ are max-masses of the points $x_{ti(t)}$, $1 \le i(t) \le |\mathrm{supp}\mu_t|$, $t = 1,\ 2,\ ...\ .$*

Proof. If condition (*) executes then (4) and (5) immediately imply that $\mu_t \to \mu$.

Inversely, let $\mu_t \to \mu$. Suppose that it does not carry out $\rho(x_i,\ x_{ti(t)}) \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, i. e. for some point $x_{i_0} \in \mathrm{supp}\mu$ each of the sequences $\theta = \{x_{ti(t)} : x_{ti(t)} \in \mathrm{supp}\mu_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ does not converge to x_{i_0}. Then for every such sequence there exists $\varepsilon_\theta > 0$ such that $\rho(x_{i_0},\ x_{\tau i(\tau)}) \ge \varepsilon_\theta$ for finitely many positive integers τ.

For every t by ξ_t denote an idempotent probability measure which exists by force of Lemma 1 such that

$$\rho_\omega(\mu, \mu_t) = \min\left\{\text{diam } X, \bigoplus_{(x_{i_0},\ x_{ti(t)})\in S\xi_t} |\lambda_{i_0} - \lambda_{ti(t)}| \odot \rho(x_{i_0}, x_{ti(t)})\right\}.$$

Then for some positive ε there exists infinitely many naturals τ such that $\rho_\omega(\mu, \mu_\tau) \geq \varepsilon$. This contradicts to convergence of $\{\mu_t\}$ to μ according to metric ρ_ω.

Assume $\lambda_{ti(t)} \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda_i$ is false. In other words there exists a max-mass λ_{i_0} of idempotent probability measure μ such that each of the sequences $\{\lambda_{ti(t)} : \lambda_{ti(t)}$ is a max-mass of the measure $\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ does not converge to λ_{i_0}. In this case similarly it may be taken a contradiction with convergency of sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ to μ according to metric ρ_ω.

Hence the convergency of a sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ to μ by metric ρ_ω implies condition (*).

Thus $\rho_t \to \mu$ and (*) are equivalent. Lemma 4 is proved.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$, $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty \subset I_\omega(X)$. Then $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$ iff the following condition satisfies:*

(*) *for each point $x_i \in supp\mu$ there exists a sequence $\{x_{ti(t)} : x_{ti(t)} \in supp\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ such that $\rho(x_i,\ x_{ti(t)}) \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and $\lambda_{ti(t)} \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda_i$ where $\lambda_{ti(t)}$ are max-masses of the points $x_{ti(t)}$, $1 \leq i(t) \leq |supp\mu_t|$, $t = 1,\ 2,\ \ldots$.*

Proof. Let condition (*) takes place. Let moreover for some i_0, $1 \leq i_0 \leq s$, we have $\lambda_{i^0} \odot \varphi(x_{i^0}) = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{s} \lambda_i \odot \varphi(x_i) = \mu(\varphi)$, where $\varphi \in C(X)$ is an arbitrary function. Then there exists t_0 such that $\lambda_{ti'(t)} \odot \varphi(x_{ti'(t)}) = \bigoplus\limits_{i(t)=1}^{s_t} \lambda_{ti(t)} \odot \varphi(x_{ti(t)}) = \mu_t(\varphi)$ for all $t \geq t_0$, where $x_{ti'(t)} \to x_{i^0}$ and $\lambda_{ti'(t)} \to \lambda_{i^0}$. Therefore for all $t \geq t_0$ the following inequality is true

$$|\mu_t(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi)| = \left|\bigoplus_{i(t)=1}^{s_t} \lambda_{ti(t)} \odot \varphi(x_{ti(t)}) - \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s} \lambda_i \odot \varphi(x_i)\right| = |\lambda_{ti'(t)} \odot \varphi(x_{ti'(t)}) - \lambda_{i^0} \odot \varphi(x_{i^0})| \leq$$

$$\leq |\lambda_{ti'(t)} - \lambda_{i^0}| + |\varphi(x_{ti'(t)}) - \varphi(x_{i^0})|.$$

As φ is continuous (*) implies $|\varphi(x_{ti'(t)}) - \varphi(x_{i^0})| \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and $|\lambda_{ti'(t)} - \lambda_{i^0}| \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$. Then it should be $|\mu_t(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi)| \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$. Since φ is an arbitrary function then it should be $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$.

Inversely, let $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$. This means that for each $\varphi \in C(X)$ and for an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a natural number t_ε, such for all $t \geq t_\varepsilon$ the following inequality it takes place

$$|\mu_t(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi)| = \left|\bigoplus_{i_t=1}^{s_t} \lambda_{i_t}^t \odot \varphi(x_{i_t}) - \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s} \lambda_i \odot \varphi(x_i)\right| < \varepsilon.$$

Suppose that (*) is false. This means for any point $x_{i_0} \in \text{supp}\mu$ either the sequence $\theta = \{x_{ti(t)} : x_{ti(t)} \in \text{supp}\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ does not converge to x_{i_0}, or corresponding sequence $\{\lambda_{ti(t)}\}_{t=1}^\infty$ does not converge to λ_{i_0}.

Assume the sequence $\theta = \{x_{ti(t)} : x_{ti(t)} \in \text{supp}\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ does not converge to x_{i_0}. For each such sequence there is $\varepsilon_\theta > 0$ such that $\rho(x_{i_0}, x_{\tau i(\tau)}) \geq \varepsilon_\theta$ for infinitely many naturals τ. For each such τ choose a function $\varphi_\tau \in C(X)$ with $\varphi_\tau(x_{i_0}) = \max\{|\lambda_i| : i = 1, ..., s\} + \varepsilon_\theta$

and $\varphi_\tau(x_{\tau i(\tau)}) = 0$ for all $i(\tau) = 1, 2, ..., s_\tau$. In carrying out these conditions one has $\mu(\varphi_\tau) \geq \lambda_{i_0} \odot \varphi_\tau(x_{i_0}) > \varepsilon_\theta$ and $\mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau) = 0$. That is why $|\mu(\varphi_\tau) - \mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau)| = |\mu(\varphi_\tau)| > \varepsilon_\theta$ for infinitely many naturals τ. We obtain a contradiction with convergence of sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ to μ by pointwise convergence topology.

No let we assume the corresponding sequences $\{\lambda_{ti(t)}\}_{t=1}^\infty$ do not converge to λ_{i_0}. It is enough to see a case when $S\mu_t = S\mu$ for all $t = 1, 2, ...$. Suppose a sequence $\{\lambda_{ti_0(t)}\}_{t=1}^\infty$ does not converge to λ_{i_0}. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such $|\lambda_{i_0} - \lambda_{\tau i_0(\tau)}| \geq \varepsilon$ for infinite many τ. For each such τ choose a function $\varphi_\tau \in C(X)$ with $\varphi_\tau(x_{i_0}) = 2|\lambda_{i_0}|$ and $\varphi_\tau(x_i) = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, ..., s$. In fulfilment these equations one has $\mu(\varphi_\tau) = |\lambda_{i_0}|$ and $\mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau) = 0 \oplus (2|\lambda_{i_0}| + \lambda_{\tau i_0(\tau)})$. If $\mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau) = 0$ then

$$|\mu(\varphi_\tau) - \mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau)| = |\mu(\varphi_\tau)| = |\lambda_{i_0}| = |\lambda_{i_0} - \lambda_{\tau i_0(\tau)}| \geq \varepsilon_\theta.$$

In the case $\mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau) = 2|\lambda_{i_0}| + \lambda_{\tau i_0(\tau)}$ it takes place the following relations

$$|\mu(\varphi_\tau) - \mu_\tau(\varphi_\tau)| = ||\lambda_{i_0}| + \lambda_{\tau i_0(\tau)}| = |\lambda_{i_0} - \lambda_{\tau i_0(\tau)}| \geq \varepsilon_\theta.$$

These two inequalities contradict the convergency of sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ to μ according to pointwise convergence topology.

Thus conditions $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$ and (*) are equivalent. Lemma 5, and thereby Theorem 2 are proved.

Let $\mu \in I_\omega(X)$ and $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty \subset I_\omega(X)$. Since for any compactum X the space $I(X)$ of idempotent probability measures is also compactum then Lemmas 4 and 5 imply the following statement.

Corollary 3. $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu \Leftrightarrow \mu_t \to \mu$.

Pointwise convergence topology on $I(X)$ denote by p.

Since $I_\omega(X)$ is everywhere dense in $I(X)$ according to p for each idempotent probability measure $\mu \in I(X) \setminus I_\omega(X)$ there exists $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty \subset I_\omega(X)$ such that $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$. Then $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is fundamental but by force of Corollary 3 it is nonconvergent in $I_\omega(X)$ according to ρ_ω. Thus metrical space $(I_\omega(X),\ \rho_\omega)$ is not complete.

Call fundamental sequences $\{\xi_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$, $\{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^\infty \subset I_\omega(X)$ are equivalent, if $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \rho_\omega(\xi_t, \eta_t) = 0$. Consider a set $I^*(X)$ of all classes of of fundamental according to metric ρ_ω sequences in $I_\omega(X)$. Let $\xi = [\{\xi_t\}_{t=1}^\infty]$, $\eta = [\{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^\infty] \in I^*(X)$. By the equality

$$d(\xi, \eta) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_\omega(\xi_t, \eta_t)$$

we define metric on $I^*(X)$, where $\{\xi_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$, $\{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ are represents of corresponding classes. It is clear that $(I^*(X), d)$ is complete metrical space. Therefore it is unique exactly isometrical completion of metrical space $(I_\omega(X), \rho_\omega)$.

Proposition 3. *Spaces $(I(X), p)$ and $(I^*(X), d)$ are homeomorphic.*

Proof. Let $(I^*(X), d)$ be completion of $I_\omega(X)$ by metric ρ_ω. Then by density $I_\omega(X)$ in $I(X)$ we have that $I(X)$ is homeomorphic put in $(I^*(X), d)$, and since $I(X)$ is compact one has $(I(X), p)$ is homeomorphic to $(I^*(X), d)$. Proposition 3 is proved.

Define now on $I(X)$ metric ρ_I by the rule

$$\rho_I(\mu, \nu) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_\omega(\mu, \nu),\ \mu,\ \nu \in I(X), \tag{6}$$

where $\{\mu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$, $\{\nu_t\}_{t=1}^\infty \subset I_\omega(X)$ are arbitrary sequences such that $\mu_t \Rightarrow \mu$ and $\nu_t \Rightarrow \nu$.

Thus we finish the proof of our main result.

Proposition 3 implies the following important statement.

Corollary 4. *Metric ρ_I on $I(X)$ generates pointwise convergence topology .*

Now Corollary 2 may be formulate for metric ρ_I.

Corollary 5. *$\rho_I|_{X\times X} = \rho$ for any metrical compactum (X, ρ).*

References

[1] M. Zarichnyi. *Idempotent probability measures, I.* //arXiv:math. GN/0608754v1 30 Aug 2006.

[2] G. L. Litvinov. *The Maslov dequantization, idempotent and tropical mathematics: a very brief introduction.* arXiv:math.GM/0501038v4 11 Jan 2006.

[3] V. V. Fedorchuk. *Triples of infinite iterations of metrizable functors.* (Russian) Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat. 54 (1990). No. 2. P. 396-417; translation in Math. USSR-Izv. 36 (1991). No. 2. P. 411-433.